UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/892,749	06/28/2001	Ikuo Sasazaki	826.1732	3645

21171 7590 03/07/2006

STAAS & HALSEY LLP
SUITE 700
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER	
PESIN, BORIS M	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2174	

DATE MAILED: 03/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/892,749	SASAZAKI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Boris Pesin	2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *28 November 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-4 and 9-13* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-4 and 9-13* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

This communication is responsive the amendment filed 11/28/2005.

Claims 1-4 and 9-13 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13 are independent claims. In the amendment filed 11/28/2005, Claims 1, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13 were amended and claims 5-8 were canceled. This action is made Final.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1, 2 and 9 – 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schoof, II (US 5440624) in view of Towell (US 6052680).

In regards to claim 1, Schoof teaches an apparatus, comprising: a storage unit storing information about a discussion at an electronic conference ("transcription and digital storage of a complete record of the conference", Column 3, Line 17). Schoof does not specifically teach a judgment unit calculating an index representing one of a number of speakers in the discussion, a number of utterances in the discussion, a depth of a tree structure of the information stored about the discussion and a data amount of the information stored about the discussion as an indication of an amount of the information stored about the discussion and said judgment unit deciding to hold a face-to-face conference if the index exceeds a specific value. Towell teaches, "In the following, an exemplary system for determining whether to route an incoming e-mail to a rule-based system for responding to a product inquiry and/or a rule-based system for scheduling a meeting is described. Referring to FIG. 2, in this exemplary system, the message preprocessing process 260 is a text to word list translation process (see, e.g., the process 600 of FIG. 6), the relevance determination process 280 is a process for determining a cosine distance (see, e.g., steps 502, 504 and 506 of FIG. 5) between an m-dimensional vector based on a preprocessed message and an m-dimensional vector based on a word list which characterizes a decision system, the decision system 1 process 220a is a rule-based decision process for scheduling a meeting, the decision system N process 220b is a rule-based decision process for responding to a product information request, the input/output interface process(es) 230 includes a SCSI adapter, the decision parameter(s) storage area 270 includes a predetermined threshold value between zero (0) and one (1), the firm data storage area 250 contains

product information, and the user data storage area includes data regarding a salesperson's work schedule, times when he or she will be in the office, and a rank ordered list of others which will handle the salespersons e-mail in their absence." (Column 8, Line 5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Schoof with the teachings of Towell and include a rule based system to schedule a meeting when certain criteria is me with the motivation to provide the user with a simple method of scheduling a meeting when appropriate.

In regards to claim 2, Schoof and Towell teach all the limitations of claim 1. Towell further teaches an apparatus further comprising a notification unit notifying participants of the electronic conference of a holding of the face-to-face conference if said judgment unit determines to hold the face-to-face conference. (Figures 11-13).

Claims 9-13 are similar in scope to claim 1; therefore they are rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schoof, II (US 5440624) and Towell (US 6052680) in view of Garback et al. (US 5237499).

In regards to claim 3, Schoof and Towell teach all the limitations of claim 2. They do not teach an apparatus further comprising a reservation unit making reservations for facilities needed to hold the face-to-face conference if said judgment unit determines to hold the face-to-face conference, said notification unit notifies expected participants of information about reserved facilities. Garback teaches a method wherein, "The CPU is

programmed to select an individual group member itinerary for the specific venue which includes specific airline flights, and if necessary, specific hotel accommodations and specific rental car services." (Abstract, Line 14). Garback further teaches, "A response message, such as is illustrated in FIG. 4, is formatted in step 69 to be returned to the individual group member traveler." (Column 7, Line 15). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Schoof and Towell with teachings of Garback to include a method of reserving facilities needed to hold meetings with the motivation to provide a convenient process of organizing the facilities to host a meeting.

In regards to claim 4, Schoof, Towell, and Garback teach all the limitations of claim 3. Garback further teaches apparatus wherein said reservation unit makes reservations for transportation needed for the expected participants to participate at the face-to-face conference ("The CPU is programmed to select an individual group member itinerary for the specific venue which includes specific airline flights, and if necessary, specific hotel accommodations and specific rental car services." Abstract, Line 14); and said notification unit notifies the expected participants of information about reserved transportation. ("A response message, such as is illustrated in FIG. 4, is formatted in step 69 to be returned to the individual group member traveler." Column 7, Line 15).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, see page 5, filed 11/28/2005, with respect to 35 USC 101 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The 35 USC 101 of claims 1-13 has been withdrawn.

Applicant's arguments filed 11/28/2005 with respect to the art rejections have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The Applicant argues that Towell does not teach a judgment unit calculating an index representing **one** of a number of speakers in the discussion, a number of utterances in the discussion, a depth of a tree structure of the information stored about the discussion and a data amount of the information stored about the discussion as an indication of an amount of the information stored about the discussion and said judgment unit deciding to hold a face-to-face conference if the index exceeds a specific value. The Examiner disagrees. Towel states, "the relevance determination process 280 is a process for determining a cosine distance (see, e.g., steps 502, 504 and 506 of FIG. 5) between an m-dimensional vector based on a preprocessed message and an m-dimensional vector based on a word list which characterizes a decision system, the decision system 1 process 220a is a rule-based decision process for scheduling a meeting" (Column 8, Lines 11-18). The cosine distance is the index. Based on this index, the system determines whether to hold a face-to-face meeting (Column 8, Lines 53-59). The way the system calculates the index is by comparing the incoming message's words with a predetermined word list (Column 6, Lines 13-32). Therefore

this index is based on the number of utterances in the discussion. The more the incoming message corresponds to the predetermined list, the higher the index and hence the higher the relevance.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Boris Pesin whose telephone number is (571) 272-4070. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday except every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on (571) 272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

BP